

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,662	07/13/2001	Yasuhito Inagaki	09792909-5081	5976
26263	7590 12/12/2006		EXAM	INER
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP			KORNAKOV, MICHAIL	
P.O. BOX 0		AC TOWER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080		1746	TALKTONIDEK	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/905,662	INAGAKI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Kornakov	1746	
 The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply 	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNI	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{0}$	2 October 2006.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allo			
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims		`	
 4) Claim(s) 6,8-16 and 19-34 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-16,20-22 and 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 6,8-13,19 and 23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 6,8-16 and 19-34 are subject to respect to the subject t	<u>24-34</u> is/are withdrawn from o		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)			
Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
	ZAGIIIIIOI. POOL IIIO GIGOIO		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		24404 240	
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority 	ents have been received. ents have been received in A	application No	
application from the International Bu			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

6) Other: __

Application/Control Number: 09/905,662 Page 2

Art Unit: 1746

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/02/2006 has been entered.
- Claims 6, 8-16, 19-34 currently pending. Claims 23-34 are new. Claims 14-16,
 were previously withdrawn from consideration.
- 3. Newly submitted independent claims 24, 32 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: if presented previously along with claim 6, they would have been restricted based on combination/subcombination relationship, wherein (1) either the combination (claim 6) as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination (claim 24) as claimed for patentability or the combination (claim 32) as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination (claim 6) as claimed for patentability or and (2) that the respective subcombinations have utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination of claim 6 as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination of claim 24 as claimed because it does not require controller connected to the pump and configured to control the pump to pump the fluid

from the source. The subcombination has separate utility such as independent etching or surface modification apparatus. The combination of claim 32 as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination of claim 6 as claimed because it does not require the presence of specific measuring means for measuring characteristics of hydrofluoric acid concentration and controller to be connected to the pump of fluid feeding system. The subcombination apparatus can be used for etching or surface modification apparatus.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 24-34 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

4. Claims 6, 8-13, 19, 23 are examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 6. Claims 6, 8-13,19, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The recited in claim 6 "a substrate cleaning bath to contain therein a substrate cleaning liquid..." constitutes an indefinite subject matter, because it is not clear if the recited "cleaning bath **to contain** therein a substrate

cleaning liquid" is an intended use of the apparatus or a part of the apparatus. If Applicants consider the cleaning liquid to be a part of the apparatus, Applicants are advised to replace the recitation "cleaning bath to contain" for ---cleaning bath containing----- in order for the liquid in the bath to be considered as part of the apparatus, but not the limitation indicating the intended use of a bath. Appropriate clarification and/or correction is required. Claims 8-13, 19, 23 are rejected because of their dependency and failure to remove the ambiguity of parent claim.

Claim Objections

- 7. Applicants' attention is drawn to claims 20-22, which depend on cancelled claim 18 and therefore can not be examined. Applicants' attention is also drawn to new claim 23, which is apparently redundant to claim 12, since claim 23 also depends on claim 6 and recites the structural elements identical to claim 12. Appropriate corrections are required.
- 8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 9. Claims 6, 8-10, 12, 13, 19, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al (U.S. 6,350,425).

Hoffman teaches a substrate processing system comprising a mixing tank 306 to contain aqueous solution of ammonium fluoride or buffered HF, the mixing tank can be the point of use, in which *the substrates are processed* (col.11, lines 65-67). This clearly reads on the substrate cleaning bath of claim 6. Further disclosed are water

Application/Control Number: 09/905,662

Art Unit: 1746

feeding means 308 for feeding DI water to the mixing tank; a valve 316 for regulating the amount of water introduced into the tank (col. 9, lines 64-67); measuring means 328 for measuring hydrofluoric acid concentration; *control means* for automatically operate the apparatus valves, including water supply valve 316, to regulate the amount of water introduced into the mixing tank. The concentration measuring means may include conductivity, density, index of refraction or infrared spectroscopy measuring equipment, volumetric or gravimetric scale (col. 9, lines 10-67; col.10, lines 1-6, 18-27, 34-37, 52-61; col.11, lines 8-11, 39-44, 65-67). The circulation system of Hoffman includes a pump and the said system is configured to circulate the cleaning liquid from the mixing tank, through the measuring means and back to the mixing tank (Fig. 3). It is noted that all the above structural limitations are operable according to Hoffman during the substrate cleaning procedure (col.11, lines 65-67).

While indicating that the mixing tank 306 can be the point of use, in which *the substrates are processed* (col.11, lines 65-67), Hoffman remains silent about a substrate carrier for holding the substrate in the processing solution. However, the Examiner takes an official notice that variety of such substrate carriers are known and utilized in the art and those skilled in the art will readily be able to integrate appropriate carrier into the apparatus of Hoffman. As to the recitation of claim 6, stating that "control means configured to process a signal from said measuring means...so that the rate at which the substrate is cleaned remains substantially constant", it is noted here that a claim containing a "recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art

apparatus" if the prior art apparatus teaches all the structural limitations of the claim, consult Ex parte Masham, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

10. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al (U.S. 6,350,425) in view of Pham et al (U.S. 6,156,944) or Swain et al (U.S. 5,895,639), each one individually.

While teaching variety of measuring means for measuring concentration of hydrofluoric acid, Hoffman does not specifically indicate measuring means consisting of liquid (ion) chromatography. However measuring concentration of HF by liquid (ion) chromatography and, therefore, means for applying liquid (ion) chromatography are also known in the art. Thus, Pham and Swain, each one individually, utilize liquid ion chromatography to determine the concentration of HF within the solution. The simplicity of implementation of liquid ion chromatography is an advantage of this technique.

Therefore, one skilled in the art may choose liquid ion chromatography among the other known concentration measuring techniques and in lieu of measuring techniques proposed by Hoffman in order to simplify measuring the concentration of HF and provide relatively inexpensive measuring means in the teaching of Hoffman.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicants' arguments filed 09/08/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue that "Hoffman does not disclose control means configured to process a signal from the sensor 328 during cleaning of the wafer in the mixing tank 306 to control the feeding of water, or any replenishing fluid, to the mixing

Art Unit: 1746

tank during cleaning of the wafer in the tank so that the rate at which the substrate is cleaned remains substantially constant." This is not found persuasive since Hoffman teaches the apparatus with the structural elements almost identical to those instantly claimed and it is well settled that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to >an< apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in <u>terms of structure rather than function</u>, In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Kornakov whose telephone number is (571) 272-1303. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1746

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

M. COSNAKON

Michael Kornakov Primary Examiner Art Unit 1746

12/10/06